APCTP-Pre2012 - xxx

arXiv:1209.2277v1 [hep-ph] 11 Sep 2012

Can Standard Model Higgs Seed the Formation of Structures in Our Universe?

Ki-Young Choi[1*] and Qing-Guo Huang[2†]

[1] *Asia Pacific Center for Theoretical Physics,*
Pohang, Gyeongbuk 790-784, Republic of Korea and
Department of Physics, POSTECH, Pohang,
Gyeongbuk 790-784, Republic of Korea and
[2] *State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,*
Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Science,
Beijing 100190, People's Republic of China

Abstract

We study the possibility that the Standard Model (SM) Higgs can seed the formation of the structures in our Universe and the temperature anisotropy in the cosmic microwave background (CMB). We found that Higgs cannot play the role of curvaton with ordinary inflation model due to the small energy density when it decays. Modulated reheating by Higgs can be another possibility. However the present bound on non-Gaussianity severely constrains the type of potential of inflaton field and the Higgs-dependent interaction.

PACS numbers:

---

[*] kiyoung.choi@apctp.org

[†] huangqg@itp.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently ATLAS and CMS at the Large Hadron Collider reported a discovery of Higgs-like particle [1, 2]. If it is a Higgs in the Standard Model, then the mass and quartic coupling of the Higgs potential are now determined with all the interactions of Higgs to the other SM particles. This can be especially important for the cosmology in the early Universe, since Higgs could have played a major role to seed the formation of the structures in the present Universe.

The potential of Higgs field h in the Standard Model takes the form

$$V(h) = -\frac{1}{2}m^2h^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}h^4, \tag{1}$$

where the mass of Higgs in the minimum is $m_h = \sqrt{2}m \simeq 125$ GeV and the self coupling $\lambda \equiv \lambda(\mu)$ has a logarithmic dependence on the energy scale. For the current central values of the top mass and strong coupling constant, the Higgs potential develops an instability around 10^{11} GeV, with a lifetime much longer than the age of the Universe. However taking into account theoretical and experimental errors, stability up to the Planck scale cannot be excluded [3, 4]. In this paper it is legitimate to assume that the Higgs potential is stable up to the energy scale of our interest below Planck scale.

The most economical model for the cosmology is that Higgs plays the role of inflation which can elegantly solve the flatness, horizon problems and so on in the Hot Big Bang model and seeds the structure formation in our universe. However Higgs in the Standard Model is difficult to explain both inflation and the structure formation. One reason is that its self-interaction is too strong and the matter density perturbation generated by Higgs-like inflaton is much bigger than what we observed [5, 6]. A possible way to achieve inflation is to introduce a coupling between Higgs field and Ricci scalar R of the form $\xi h^2 R$ [7, 8]. However this model is plagued by several issues such as unitarity problem [9], and the stability of the potential up to the near Planck scale [6].

Even though the Higgs is not a good candidate of inflaton, it may contribute to the primordial curvature perturbation and seed the structure formation and anisotropies in cosmic microwave background radiation through the processes such as curvaton, modulated reheating, inhomogeneous end of inflation etc [10].

When the mass of the Higgs is smaller than the Hubble parameter, Higgs has cosmological perturbation on super horizon scales at horizon exit. During inflation this remains the isocurvature perturbation, however it can be converted to the adiabatic one after or at the end of inflation. Here we can calculate the perturbation of Higgs field and the amount of the contribution to the curvature perturbation.

In this paper we study models of generation of perturbation with Higgs assuming that there is another scalar field for the inflation. In a given scenario, we derive the cosmological observables such as Power spectrum as well as spectral index, tensor-to-scalar ratio, and non-Gaussianity parameters. When we compare them with present observational constraints, we find that the Higgs field it cannot play the role as a curvaton. In a modulated reheating scenario, Higgs can be a dominant source for the curvature perturbation for quadratic type potential of inflation field, however, otherwise it can contribute at most 30 % to the power spectrum.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we study the possibility of Higgs as curvaton. In Section III we consider the modulated reheating by Higgs. In Section IV we summarize our results.

II. HIGGS FIELD AS CURVATON

In curvaton scenario [11–15], curvaton is a light scalar field which is subdominant during inflation, and inflation is driven by the potential energy of another scalar field, so-called inflaton ϕ. After inflation the inflaton field oscillate and transfer its vacuum energy to the radiation through the reheating mechanism. The curvaton density can be important after inflation and can give dominate contribution to the primordial curvature perturbation when it decays. Different types of potentials of curvaton [16] were studied in the Literatures including the inflaton contribution [17] to study the power spectrum and non-Gaussianities [18]. In this section we study the possibility of the Higgs field in the standard model as a curvaton.

The inflation is driven by additional scalar field, inflaton, and it should happen at very high energy scale. Considering the upper limit of the Hubble parameter from the tensor-to-scalar ratio, the Hubble parameter is only constrained to satisfy,

$$H \lesssim 3 \times 10^{14}\,\mathrm{GeV}. \tag{2}$$

During inflation the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of Higgs field is expected to be of the order of Hubble parameter which is much larger than its physical mass. Thus it is reasonable to simplify Higgs potential Eq. (1) to be quartic as

$$V(h) \simeq \frac{\lambda}{4} h^4. \tag{3}$$

In the high energy scale inflation, the size of the Higgs self coupling is $\lambda(\mu) \simeq \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ [3, 4]. For simplicity we take $\lambda \simeq 0.01$ and constant at the scale of our study. The effective mass square of Higgs is given by

$$m_{\text{eff}}^2 = V_{hh} = 3\lambda h^2. \tag{4}$$

When the effective mass of the Higgs field is smaller than the Hubble parameter, it acquires visible quantum fluctuations around the vacuum value during inflation, and may seed the structure formation and anisotropy in the CMB. This condition requires that during inflation

$$h \ll \frac{H}{\sqrt{3\lambda}}. \tag{5}$$

The upper bound on the Hubble parameter Eq. (2) sets an upper limit on the the value of Higgs field $h \ll 6H \lesssim 2 \times 10^{15}$ GeV.

Because Higgs is quite light, it almost does not move and its VEV is kept fixed during inflation. One can easily check that the Higgs energy density is subdominant by the order of H^2/M_P^2 as long as Eq. (5) is satisfied. On the other hand, the amplitude of Higgs quantum fluctuations during inflation is given by

$$\delta h = \frac{H}{2\pi}. \tag{6}$$

Combining with Eq. (5), we conclude that

$$0.03 \simeq \frac{\sqrt{3\lambda}}{2\pi} \lesssim \frac{\delta h}{h} \lesssim 1, \tag{7}$$

which is independent on the precise value of Hubble parameter. Here we consider the VEV of Higgs should not be less than the amplitude of its quantum fluctuations.

After inflation inflaton field oscillates around its local minimum and its potential energy is converted into radiations to initiate the radiation-dominated Universe. During this time, Higgs field starts oscillation when the effective mass becomes bigger than the Hubble expansion, namely when

$$H_{\text{osc}}^2 = m_{\text{eff}}^2 = 3\lambda h^2. \tag{8}$$

The energy density of an oscillating Higgs decreases as a^{-4} which is similar to radiations. During oscillation epoch, the ratio of Higgs energy density to the background energy density dominated by radiation continues to be constant. After some oscillations of Higgs, the energy of Higgs condensate is transferred to the radiation by perturbative and non-perturbative process. Since the coupling of Higgs to other fields are strong the energy transfer is completed soon after the start of oscillation [19, 20]. Therefore the Higgs density parameter Ω_h at the time of Higgs decay is approximatetely the same as the onset of oscillation of Higgs, which is given by

$$\Omega_h = \frac{\rho_h}{\rho_r} = \left(\frac{\rho_h}{\rho_r}\right)_{\rm osc} = \frac{\lambda/4\, h_{\rm osc}^4}{3M_P^2 H_{\rm osc}^2} = \frac{h^2}{36M_P^2} \ll \frac{H^2}{108\lambda M_P^2} \lesssim 1.5 \times 10^{-8}. \tag{9}$$

Here we used $h_{\rm osc} = h$ which is constant during inflation and Eq. (2) and Eq. (5) for the inequality. Roughly speaking, the density perturbation generated by Higgs-like curvaton is

$$\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho} \sim \frac{\rho_h}{\rho}\frac{\delta\rho_h}{\rho_h} \sim \frac{\rho_h}{\rho}\frac{\delta h}{h} \sim \Omega_h \frac{\delta h}{h} \tag{10}$$

which is less than Ω_h. Therefore we conclude that the Higgs-like curvaton cannot make a significant contribution to the density perturbation we observed today. In the Ref. [21], the authors argued that Higgs is also an unwanted curvaton even in the context of generalized G inflation model.

III. MODULATED REHEATING BY HIGGS

In this section, we examine the possibility of Higgs as a modulating particle in the reheating mechanism by inflaton field and the amount of the contribution to the primordial curvature perturbation. After inflation the energy density in the inflaton field must be transferred into radiation. In the simplest case of single field inflation model without any other light scalars, reheating process does not affect the primordial curvature perturbation on scales which are observable today, because these scales were much larger than the horizon at the time of reheating. However there may be a subdominant light scalar field present during inflation and this field can modulate the efficiency of reheating [23–25]. This makes the reheating a spatially dependent. The quasi-scale invariant perturbations in this light field, which during inflation are an isocurvature perturbation, may be converted into the primordial curvature perturbation during this process.

We consider that the inflaton field, ϕ, drives inflation and its subsequent decay during oscillation transfers the vacuum energy of inflaton field to the radiation background. For this we assume a inflaton potential and its interaction with other fields as follows

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi - V(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}. \tag{11}$$

Here $V(\phi)$ is the potential which is responsible for the inflation and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}$ is the interaction which is responsible for the inflaton decay and has dependence on the Higgs VEV, h. For simplicity we will take a polynomial potential $V(\phi) \propto \phi^{2\alpha}$ and the Higgs dependent interactions [29]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} \supset -\sum_a y_a(h)\phi\bar{\psi}_a\psi_a - \sum_a M(h)\phi\chi_a^2 - \sum_a g_a(h)\phi^2\chi_a^2, \tag{12}$$

where χ_a and ψ_a are scalar and fermion fields which contribute to the radiation in the early Universe. The coupling constants $y_a(h)$, $M_a(h)$, and $g_a(h)$ are functions of the Higgs field h.

The total decay rate of the inflaton is given by the sum of Higgs independent and dependent part,

$$\Gamma(h) = \Gamma^I + \Gamma^D(h), \tag{13}$$

where $\Gamma^D(h)$ has the form of [29]

$$\Gamma^D(h) = \sum_a A_n \frac{y_a^2(h)}{8\pi} m_\phi^{\text{eff}} + \sum_a B_n \frac{M_a(h)^2}{8\pi m_\phi^{\text{eff}}} + \sum_a C_n \frac{h_a^2(h)}{8\pi (m_\phi^{\text{eff}})^3}\rho_\phi, \tag{14}$$

with m_ϕ^{eff} the effective mass of the inflaton field defined by $(m_\phi^{\text{eff}})^2 = \partial^2 V/\partial^2\phi$ and A_n, B_n, and C_n are numerical coefficients of the order of $\mathcal{O}(1-1000)$ [29].

Here we consider that inflaton field ϕ slowly rolls down its potential $V(\phi)$ and then inflaton field does not contribute to the curvature perturbation at non-linear orders. In the inflaton-modulated reheating mixed scenario, the curveture perturbation is written as [25, 29]

$$\zeta = \frac{1}{M_P^2}\frac{V}{V_\phi}\delta\phi_* + Q_h\delta h_* + \frac{1}{2}Q_{hh}\delta h_*^2 + \frac{1}{6}Q_{hhh}\delta h_*^3 + \cdots , \tag{15}$$

where Q is a function of $\Gamma(h)/H_c$ calculated at a time t_c which is after several oscillations of the inflaton but well before the time of decay of inflaton. A quantity with subscript $*$ is evaluated when the corresponding scale crosses the Hubble horizon during inflation. For $\Gamma/H_c \ll 1$, Q can be well approximated by

$$Q = a_0 \log\left(\Gamma/H_c\right), \tag{16}$$

where a_0 has different value and sign for different inflaton potential and interaction for the dominant decay mode. The value of a_0 for some of the examples are given in the Table I of Ref. [29]. With this form we find the derivatives

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_h &= a_0 \frac{\Gamma_h}{\Gamma}, \\
Q_{hh} &= a_0 \left(\frac{\Gamma_{hh}}{\Gamma} - \frac{\Gamma_h^2}{\Gamma^2} \right), \\
Q_{hhh} &= a_0 \left(\frac{\Gamma_{hhh}}{\Gamma} - 3\frac{\Gamma_h \Gamma_{hh}}{\Gamma^2} + 2\frac{\Gamma_h^3}{\Gamma^3} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

From Eq. (15), the power spectrum of curvature perturbation is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta = \mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\phi} + \mathcal{P}_{\zeta_h} = \frac{1}{2M_P^2 \epsilon_*} \left(\frac{H_*}{2\pi} \right)^2 (1 + \tilde{r}), \tag{18}$$

where

$$\tilde{r} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_\phi}}{\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_h}} = 2M_P^2 \epsilon_* Q_h^2, \tag{19}$$

and

$$\epsilon \equiv \frac{M_P^2}{2} \left(\frac{V_\phi}{V} \right)^2. \tag{20}$$

The spectral index of power spectrum of curvature perturbation is

$$n_s \equiv 1 + \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_\zeta}{d \ln k} = (1 - \beta) n_{\zeta_\phi} + \beta n_{\zeta_h}, \tag{21}$$

where $\beta \equiv \tilde{r}/(1 + \tilde{r}) \in [0, 1]$,

$$n_{\zeta_\phi} = 1 - 6\epsilon + 2\eta_{\phi\phi}, \tag{22}$$

$$n_{\zeta_h} = 1 - 2\epsilon + 2\eta_{hh}, \tag{23}$$

and

$$\eta_{\phi\phi} \equiv M_P^2 \frac{V_{\phi\phi}}{V}, \quad \eta_{hh} \equiv \frac{V_{hh}}{3H^2}. \tag{24}$$

The gravitational wave perturbation only depends on the total energy density during inflation, and the amplitude of its power spectrum takes the form

$$\mathcal{P}_T = \frac{H_*^2/M_P^2}{\pi^2/2}, \tag{25}$$

whose tilt is defined by

$$n_T \equiv \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_T}{d \ln k} = -2\epsilon_*. \tag{26}$$

Usually we introduce a new parameter, so-called tensor-to-scaler ratio r, to measure the size of gravitational wave perturbation,

$$r \equiv \frac{\mathcal{P}_T}{\mathcal{P}_\zeta} = (1-\beta)16\epsilon_*. \tag{27}$$

And thus the consistency relation for inflaton-modulated reheating scenario becomes

$$n_T = -\frac{1}{1-\beta}\frac{r}{8}. \tag{28}$$

For $\beta \to 1$, the consistency relation will be quite different from that in single-field slow-roll inflation model.

Typically $\Gamma^D(h)$ is assumed to be proportional to h^n with $n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$. Therefore for each case

$$Q_h = a_0 B_h \frac{n}{h}, \tag{29}$$

where $B_h \equiv \Gamma^D/\Gamma$, the fraction of the Higgs-dependent decay rate to the total decay rate of inflaton field. Considering $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_h} = Q_h^2 \left(\frac{H_*}{2\pi}\right)^2 = \beta P_\zeta$, $\mathcal{P}_\zeta = 2.46 \times 10^{-9}$ and Eq. (7), we have

$$B_h = 3.1 \times 10^{-4} \frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{n|a_0|}\left(\frac{h_*}{H_*}\right) \ll 1.7 \times 10^{-3} \frac{\sqrt{\beta}}{n|a_0|}, \tag{30}$$

where the last inequality comes from Eq. (5). For $\sqrt{\beta} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-1} \sim 1)$ and $a_0 \sim 0.1$, we conclude that

$$B_h \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3} \sim 10^{-2}). \tag{31}$$

It indicates that inflaton decay is dominated by the Higgs independent decay.

We can also calculate the non-linearity parameters $f_{\rm NL}$, $\tau_{\rm NL}$, and $g_{\rm NL}$. Following [29], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{\rm NL} &= \frac{5}{6}\frac{\beta^2}{a_0}\left(-1 + \frac{\Gamma\Gamma_{hh}}{\Gamma_h^2}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon, \eta), \\
\tau_{\rm NL} &= \frac{\beta^3}{a_0^2}\left(1 - \frac{\Gamma\Gamma_{hh}}{\Gamma_h^2}\right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2, \epsilon\eta, \eta^2), \\
g_{\rm NL} &= \frac{25\beta^3}{54a_0^2}\left(2 - 3\frac{\Gamma\Gamma_{hh}}{\Gamma_h^2} + \frac{\Gamma^2\Gamma_{hhh}}{\Gamma_h^3}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon\eta, \xi^2, \eta^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Taking into account $\Gamma^D(h) \propto h^n$, $f_{\rm NL}$ can be written by

$$f_{\rm NL} \simeq -\frac{5}{6}\frac{\beta^2}{a_0} + \frac{5}{6}\frac{\beta^2}{a_0 B_h}\frac{n-1}{n}. \tag{33}$$

For $n = 1$, $f_{\rm NL} \simeq -\frac{5}{6}\frac{\beta^2}{a_0}$, which is smaller than $\mathcal{O}(1 \sim 10)$; for $n > 1$, $f_{\rm NL}$ is dominated by the second term in the above formulation. For the case with large $f_{\rm NL}$, the non-Gaussianity parameters characterizing the size of trispectrum become

$$\tau_{\rm NL} \simeq \frac{36}{25\beta} f_{\rm NL}^2, \tag{34}$$

$$g_{\rm NL} \simeq \frac{2(n-2)}{3(n-1)\beta} f_{\rm NL}^2 - \frac{5}{3}\frac{\beta}{a_0} f_{\rm NL}. \tag{35}$$

If $\beta \ll 1$, $\tau_{\rm NL}$ are significantly enhanced compared to $f_{\rm NL}^2$.

The present bound on $f_{\rm NL}$ by WAMP is

$$-10 < f_{\rm NL} < 74 \quad (95\%\,{\rm CL}), \tag{36}$$

which may give a bound on the parameter β. For $n = 1$, if $V(\phi) \propto \phi^2$, we have $a_0 = -1/6$ [29], $f_{\rm NL} = 5\beta^2 \leq 5$ [1] and then the current bound on $f_{\rm NL}$ does not give any constraint on β; if $V(\phi) \propto \phi^6$ we have $a_0 = 1/6,\ 1/30,\ 1/18$ corresponding to the dominant interaction for inflaton decay $-y\phi\bar{\psi}\psi$, $-M\phi\chi^2$, $-\lambda_\phi\phi^2\chi^2$ respectively, and the bound on $f_{\rm NL}$ implies

$$\beta < \min(\sqrt{12a_0}, 1). \tag{37}$$

We see that Higgs can significantly contribute to the curvature perturbation in the case of $n = 1$.

For $n > 1$, $f_{\rm NL} \simeq \frac{5}{6}\frac{n-1}{n}\frac{\beta^2}{a_0 B_h}$. In the case of $V(\phi) \propto \phi^2$, $a_0 < 0$, and then $\beta^2 < \frac{12n}{n-1}|a_0|B_h$. Combining with Eq. (30), we obtain

$$\beta \lesssim \frac{0.075}{(n-1)^{2/3}}. \tag{38}$$

In the case of $V(\phi) \propto \phi^6$, $a_0 > 0$, the bound on $f_{\rm NL}$ yields $\beta^2 < \frac{89n}{n-1}|a_0|B_h$, and hence

$$\beta \lesssim \frac{0.28}{(n-1)^{2/3}}. \tag{39}$$

Therefore the Higgs can contribute at most 30 % to the curvature perturbation.

---

[1] If a positive $f_{\rm NL} > 5$ is detected by forthcoming observations, such as PLANCK etc, this case will be ruled out.

IV. DISCUSSION

We have examined the viability of the Higgs in the Standard Model as a dominant source of the primordial curvature perturbation. We find that Higgs as a curvaton is difficult since the energy density of the Higgs condensate is too small at the time of energy transfer of Higgs to the radiation. In the modulated reheating scenario, Higgs can dominantly contribute to the perturbation when the Higgs-dependent decay rate is linearly proportional to the Higgs VEV. In this case the primordial non-Gaussianity generated by Higgs should be small. On the other hand, if the Higgs-dependent decay rate non-linearly depends on Higgs VEV, usually a too large Bispectrum is predicted and the current bound on the non-linearity parameter gives upper bound 30% on the contribution of the Higgs to the total curvature perturbation.

Acknowledgments

K.-Y.C was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (No. 2011-0011083). K.-Y.C acknowledges the Max Planck Society (MPG), the Korea Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST), Gyeongsangbuk-Do and Pohang City for the support of the Independent Junior Research Group at the Asia Pacific Center for Theoretical Physics (APCTP). K.-Y.C would like to thank the ITP of CAS for warm hospitality during his stay where this work was initiated. QGH is supported by the project of Knowledge Innovation Program of Chinese Academy of Science and a grant from NSFC (grant NO. 10975167).

---

[1] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].

[2] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].

[3] J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori, A. Riotto and A. Strumia, Phys. Lett. B **709** (2012) 222 [arXiv:1112.3022 [hep-ph]].

[4] G. Degrassi, S. Di Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, JHEP **1208** (2012) 098 [arXiv:1205.6497 [hep-ph]].

[5] A. D. Linde, Chur, Switzerland: Harwood (1990) 362 p. (Contemporary concepts in physics, 5) [hep-th/0503203], D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, Phys. Rept. **314** (1999) 1 [hep-ph/9807278], A. D. Linde, Lect. Notes Phys. **738** (2008) 1 [arXiv:0705.0164 [hep-th]].

[6] G. Isidori, V. S. Rychkov, A. Strumia and N. Tetradis, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 025034 [arXiv:0712.0242 [hep-ph]].

[7] J. L. Cervantes-Cota and H. Dehnen, Nucl. Phys. B **442** (1995) 391 [astro-ph/9505069].

[8] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **659** (2008) 703 [arXiv:0710.3755 [hep-th]].

[9] C. P. Burgess, H. M. Lee and M. Trott, JHEP **0909** (2009) 103 [arXiv:0902.4465 [hep-ph]], J. L. F. Barbon and J. R. Espinosa, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 081302 [arXiv:0903.0355 [hep-ph]], C. P. Burgess, H. M. Lee and M. Trott, JHEP **1007** (2010) 007 [arXiv:1002.2730 [hep-ph]].

[10] A. De Simone and A. Riotto, arXiv:1208.1344 [hep-ph].

[11] S. Mollerach, Phys. Rev. D **42** 313 (1990).

[12] A. D. Linde and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys. Rev. D **56** 535 (1997).

[13] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Lett. B **524**, 5 (2002).

[14] T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **522**, 215 (2001) [Erratum-ibid. B **539**, 303 (2002)].

[15] K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, Nucl. Phys. B **626**, 395 (2002).

[16] K. Dimopoulos, G. Lazarides, D. Lyth and R. Ruiz de Austri, Phys. Rev. D **68** 123515 (2003);
K. Enqvist and S. Nurmi, JCAP **0510** 013 (2005);
Q. G. Huang, Phys. Lett. B **669**, 260 (2008);
K. Enqvist and T. Takahashi, JCAP **0809**, 012 (2008);
Q. G. Huang and Y. Wang, JCAP **0809** 025 (2008);
Q. G. Huang, JCAP **0811**, 005 (2008);
M. Kawasaki, K. Nakayama and F. Takahashi, JCAP **0901**, 026 (2009);
P. Chingangbam and Q. G. Huang, JCAP **0904**, 031 (2009);
K. Enqvist, S. Nurmi, G. Rigopoulos, O. Taanila and T. Takahashi, JCAP **0911**, 003 (2009);
K. Enqvist and T. Takahashi, JCAP **0912**, 001 (2009);
K. Enqvist, S. Nurmi, O. Taanila and T. Takahashi, JCAP **1004**, 009 (2010);
Q. G. Huang, JCAP **1011**, 026 (2010) [Erratum-ibid. **1102**, E01 (2011)];
C. T. Byrnes, K. Enqvist and T. Takahashi, JCAP **1009**, 026 (2010);
K. -Y. Choi and O. Seto, Phys. Rev. D **82** 103519 (2010);
J. Fonseca and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 064025 (2011);

C. T. Byrnes, K. Enqvist, S. Nurmi and T. Takahashi, JCAP **1111**, 011 (2011);
M. Kawasaki, T. Kobayashi and F. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 123506 (2011) [Phys. Rev. D **85**, 029905 (2012)].

[17] D. Langlois and F. Vernizzi, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 063522 (2004);
G. Lazarides, R. R. de Austri and R. Trotta, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 123527 (2004);
F. Ferrer, S. Rasanen and J. Valiviita, JCAP **0410**, 010 (2004);
T. Moroi, T. Takahashi and Y. Toyoda, Phys. Rev. D **72** 023502 (2005);
T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **72** 023505 (2005);
K. Ichikawa, T. Suyama, T. Takahashi and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 023513 (2008).

[18] D. H. Lyth, C. Ungarelli and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 023503 (2003), N. Bartolo, S. Matarrese and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D **69** 043503 (2004), D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** 121302 (2005), M. Sasaki, J. Valiviita and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **74** 103003 (2006), K. A. Malik and D. H. Lyth, JCAP **0609** 008 (2006), K. Y. Choi and J. O. Gong, JCAP **0706** 007 (2007).

[19] F. Bezrukov, D. Gorbunov and M. Shaposhnikov, JCAP **0906** (2009) 029 [arXiv:0812.3622 [hep-ph]].

[20] J. Garcia-Bellido, D. G. Figueroa and J. Rubio, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 063531 [arXiv:0812.4624 [hep-ph]].

[21] T. Kunimitsu and J. 'i. Yokoyama, arXiv:1208.2316 [hep-ph].

[22] Y. -F. Cai and D. A. Easson, arXiv:1202.1285 [hep-th].

[23] G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **69** 023505 (2004).

[24] L. Kofman, arXiv:astro-ph/0303614.

[25] M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 043508 (2004).

[26] C. W. Bauer, M. L. Graesser and M. P. Salem, Phys. Rev. D **72** 023512 (2005).

[27] B. A. Bassett, S. Tsujikawa and D. Wands, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 537 (2006).

[28] T. Suyama and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 023505 (2008).

[29] K. Ichikawa, T. Suyama, T. Takahashi, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. **D78** 063545 (2008).